

# **APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX A: Cross Referencing of Section 497.7 of  
CCR Title 23, Division 2 Components of the application**

This section lists where in the application the components specifically required by the California Code of Regulations can be found. Numbering follows that of Section 497.7 of the California Code of Regulations.

*(a) A description of the proposed project including:*

*(1) A statement of the problem being addressed*

Please refer to section II, Project Objectives, in the body of the grant application.

*(2) A discussion of the ways that the project addresses the problem and satisfies the purposes described in Section 497.5(a)(2).*

Please refer to section II, Project Objectives, in the body of the grant application.

*(3) A description of the project approach*

Please refer to section II, Project Objectives, in the body of the grant application.

*(4) A discussion of the expected outcome and benefits of the project*

Please refer to section II, Project Objectives, in the body of the grant application.

*(5) A description of the geographic boundaries of the project*

The geographic boundaries of the project are shown in Figure 2, Project Features, in the body of the grant application. Generally, the project is bordered on north and east by the Sacramento River and on the west by the Yolo Bypass, which is coincident with a portion of the site, and on the south by private agricultural land.

*(6) Verification that the project is located at least partially in one of the qualifying areas listed in Section 497.5(a).*

Please refer to section III(G), Minimum Qualifications, in the body of the grant application.

*(7) A description and justification of any proposed use of program funds for flood control system or water system repairs performed as part of an easement program or a project developed or financed under the program (Water Code Section 79043).*

The project does not propose to use grant funds for any system repairs.

*(8) A demonstration that the project is technically feasible.*

As the project does not involve new engineered or constructed works, there are no physical or technical limits on project feasibility. Instead, feasibility is determined by the availability of a willing seller [please refer to section III(E), Minimum Qualifications, in the body of the grant application].

- (9) *A hydrologic and hydraulic analysis prepared by a civil engineer registered pursuant to California law.*

A hydrologic and hydraulic analysis has been attached as Appendix E. Information contained therein and from other engineering sources has also been incorporated throughout the application as needed.

- (10) *A complete initial study environmental checklist as required by Section 15063(f), Title 1, California Code of Regulations, and if available a completed Environmental Impact Report or other environmental documentation as required by CEQA.*

Please refer to Appendix D for CEQA documentation.

- (11) *A list of required permits for the project and an implementation plan for their procurement.*

The project consists solely of acquisition of property rights. No permits are required.

- (b) *Maps and drawings as necessary to describe the project, including:*

- (1) *A vicinity map*

Please refer to Figure 1, Vicinity Map, in the body of the grant application.

- (2) *A map indicating location of project features and boundaries of affected property.*

Please refer to Figure 2, Proposed Project Features, in the body of the grant application.

- (3) *Drawings or sketches of project features as necessary to describe them.*

Please refer to Figure 2, Proposed Project Features, in the body of the grant application.

- (c) *A financial summary including:*

- (1) *The estimated cost of the project broken down by task*

Table A-1 presents the costs of the project by task. Also please refer to Section VI(A), Miscellaneous Benefits and Quality of Proposal, in the body of the grant application.

**Table A-1  
River Ranch Costs by Task**

<b>Action</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Time</b>
Purchase and Sales Agreement	Sale agreement finalized and signed	\$50,000	January 23, 2003
Deposit	Deposit for land purchase to be applied toward the final purchase price	\$200,000 (Non-refundable within 120 days)	\$50,000 within 3 months of the sales agreement/\$150,000 within 4 months
Application for Grants	AFT will apply for and identify grants fund sources: Dept of Water Resources; California Farmland Conservancy Program; Farm and Ranch Land Protection Program' CALFED B-1 Other; Yolo County NCCP Implementation; Proposition 50	\$0	Within 180 days of sales agreement
Loan Funding	Packard Foundation will provide PRI loan to AFT	\$9,000,000	6 months after sales agreement is finalized
Acquisition of Property	AFT will acquire property with loan funds and pay for closing costs	\$9,000,000 + \$23,000 (closing costs)	Upon funding from PRI
Repayment of Loan	AFT will pay back PRI loan through grants and/or private funds	\$9,000,000	Expected within 6 months of loan award
Conveyance of Easements	AFT will convey a flood easement to DWR and an agricultural conservation easement to an appropriate organization	Easement transaction costs (estimated \$10,000)	At close of escrow
Development of management and conservation plan for property	AFT will develop a detailed management and conservation plan for the property	Plan preparation costs (estimated \$20,000)	At close of escrow

*(2) The estimated flood control benefits of the project*

Please refer to Section IV, Flood Protection Benefits, in the body of the grant application.

*(3) The amount of the grant requested*

Please refer to Section VI(A), Miscellaneous Benefits and Quality of Proposal, in the body of the grant application.

*(4) The estimated amount to be funded by the applicant*

Please refer to Section VI(A), Miscellaneous Benefits and Quality of Proposal, in the body of the grant application.

*(5) Identification of any other parties contributing to the cost, and the amounts and activities to be funded by them.*

Please refer to Section VI(A), Miscellaneous Benefits and Quality of Proposal, in the body of the grant application.

*(d) A summary of proposed property acquisition rights including:*

*(1) Identification of each property*

The properties for which rights will be acquired are listed in Table 2 by Assessor's Parcel Number.

<b>Table A-2: River Ranch Property Owners</b>		
<b>Assessor's Parcel Number</b>		<b>Owner</b>
057-020-06	057-060-03	Farmland Reserve Inc. c/o Farm Management Company Attn: Robert L. Cowan 139 East South Temple St, Ste 110 Salt Lake City, Utah 84111 Telephone (801) 359-1600  Note that a purchase option on the property is now held by Wildlands, Inc., which has agreed to arrange for the sale of the property to AFT (see Appendix G). By exercise of this option, Wildlands will become the farming tenant on the property and the lessor for other rights. Wildlands can be reached at:  Wildlands, Inc. 5910 Auburn Blvd, Ste 9 Citrus Heights, CA 95621 Telephone (916) 331-8810
057-030-03	057-060-05	
057-030-06	057-060-07	
057-030-08	057-100-01	
057-050-02	057-100-02	
057-050-03	057-100-03	
057-060-02	057-110-01	

*(2) Names, addresses and telephone numbers of the property owners and lessees or tenants.*

Please refer to Table A-2.

*(3) The type of property rights to be acquired (such as easement or fee title).*

The project would result in the acquisition of fee title to the property. Please refer to section II, Project Objectives, in the body of the grant application.

*(4) Evidence that affected landowners are willing participants in any proposed real property transactions.*

Please refer to Appendix G for evidence that the affected landowners are willing sellers.

*(5) A justification of any proposed acquisition of fee interest in property to protect or enhance a flood protection corridor or floodplain while preserving or enhancing agricultural use (Water Code Section 79037(b)(1)) which includes:*

- a. Reason for the fee title acquisition*
- b. Alternatives considered to fee title acquisition for each property*
- c. Proposed final disposition of the property*
- d. Effect on county property tax revenue*

AFT is very experienced in the completion of transactions that use private, state and federal funds for the acquisition of less-than-fee property interests (i.e. easements) to protect land for its agricultural viability. After examining the appraisal for the River Ranch, Yolo County zoning and land-use designations, development patterns in the area and the desired uses of the property, we believe that a fee title acquisition is the appropriate means to achieve the objectives of the FPCP. Rather than attempting a complex easement valuation process through this grant, AFT believes that a simple fee title acquisition and voluntary conveyance of easements for flood protection corridor enhancement and agricultural land conservation will best serve the clear public interests for the region articulated in the SRFCP, CALFED and the Comprehensive Study.

The main problem with pursuing an easement valuation for the property is two-fold: we are interested in negotiating and conveying a flood easement to the State that does not significantly reduce the agricultural value of the property. Additionally, the development value appraisal issues are very speculative at this point due to the project's location in Yolo County and applicable zoning ordinances and policies. The project's economic, social and environmental benefits to the Sacramento region far outweigh the costs of acquiring this property. Unfortunately, there is no way to balance these costs and benefits in an easement appraisal, so we have proposed to go the route of fee title acquisition. This should allow DWR to demonstrate to all concerned the cost-effective nature of this investment vis-à-vis much more expensive structural flood control solutions to protect Natomas and the downstream Sacramento urban area.

A typical easement valuation appraisal attempts to capture either lost value due to restrictions (i.e. lost agricultural revenue potential due to a flowage easement) or value a "highest and best use" of the property beyond its current usage. In the case of River Ranch, AFT is not interested in discontinuing agricultural operations on the property in order to operate it solely for flood control purposes or to further develop the land to some "higher and better use". For instance, the walnut orchards on the property are valued in the

appraisal at \$5,808,000. If AFT were proposing that the flowage easement would eliminate this value, then we could make the case for a \$6 million grant in exchange for easement conveyance. However, we want to find a way to continue walnut production or other high-value crops consistent with economic needs for the property, and still allow for the short and long-term flood control benefits from the project. Therefore, we believe that a traditional easement purchase is not the appropriate vehicle in this situation.

AFT may choose to sell the property at some future date at fair market value to a qualified buyer. We also intend to pay property taxes on the land so long as we own it and it is in agricultural production.

*(e) A tentative work plan for the project including:*

*(1) A timetable for execution of the project*

See (c)(1) above.

*(2) A task breakdown for the project*

See (c)(1) above.

*(3) A description of how services of the California Conservation Corps, or local community conservation corps will be used in the project.*

No physical work is required to complete the project, so it is not feasible to use the CCC.

*(f) A list of names and addresses of owners of all property interests in parcels adjacent to those for which acquisition of property rights is proposed.*

The property owners for adjoining parcels are listed in Table A-3.

**Table A-3:  
Adjoining Property Owners**

<b>Assessor's Parcel #</b>	<b>Owner</b>
<b><i>Yolo County</i></b>	
057-020-01      057-060-08	Sacramento and San Joaquin Drainage District California Department of Water Resources 1416 -- 9 <sup>th</sup> Street Room 431 Sacramento, CA 95814
057-020-10      057-070-05	
057-030-02      057-070-06	
057-030-04	
057-030-05      057-050-01	Knaggs Walnut Ranches Co. LP Layton Knaggs Estate PO Box 970 Woodland, CA 95776
057-030-07      057-100-04	
057-030-09      057-100-05	
057-040-01      057-110-02	
057-040-02      057-110-03	
057-060-04	The Lang Family #1 Ltd Partnership 13018 County Road 117 West Sacramento, CA 95691
057-070-02	Hershey Land Company 16 Toyon Drive Woodland, CA 95695
<b><i>Sacramento County*</i></b>	
201-0010-007      201-0140-043	County of Sacramento Department of Airports 9600 Airport Blvd Sacramento, CA 95837
201-0010-009      201-0140-044	
201-0010-012      201-0140-045	
201-0010-013      201-0140-046	
201-0010-014      201-0140-047	
201-0140-015      201-0140-049	
201-0140-035      201-0140-050	
201-0140-036      201-0140-051	
201-0140-042      201-0140-052	
201-0010-045	Reclamation District 1000 Sacramento, CA 95836
<b><i>Sutter County*</i></b>	
34-180-003	Teichert Land Co. PO Box 13308 Sacramento, CA 95813
34-180-004	
34-190-017	
34-200-007	Evelyn A. Brennan 6631 Flamingo Way Sacramento, CA 95828
34-200-008	Dennis F. Dillon 6148 2nd Street Rio Linda, CA 95673
34-200-009	Auburn Investors DBA Verona Marina 6955 Garden Highway Nicolaus, CA 95659
34-200-011	



**Table A-3:  
Adjoining Property Owners**

<b>Assessor's Parcel #</b>	<b>Owner</b>
34-200-017	Yoshiko Smith 211 Pearl St Monterey, CA 93940
34-200-018	California Department of Transportation PO Box 911 Marysville, CA 95901
34-210-011 34-210-012	Fred C. Holmes Jr. Trust et al. PO Box 325 Oakville, CA 94562
35-010-020	Sacramento/San Joaquin Drainage District 9 <sup>th</sup> & O Streets Sacramento, CA 95814
35-010-022	Myron A. Sidie DBA Verona Village 2000 K St Sacramento, CA 95814
35-010-024	Reclamation District 1001 1959 Cornelius Ave Rio Oso, CA 95674
35-010-025    35-351-010 35-330-023    35-352-006 35-351-008    35-352-007 35-351-009    35-362-006	California Dept of Water Resources c/o State Lands Comm. 1807 13 <sup>th</sup> St Sacramento, CA 95814
35-020-005 35-020-006 35-020-014	Burton H. Lauppe et al. 11000 Garden Highway Sacramento, CA 95837
35-020-008 35-020-012	Odysseus Farms PO Box H Yuba City, CA 95992
35-020-010	Verona Farming Ptn c/o Agriculture Industries PO Box 1076 West Sacramento, CA 95691
35-030-006	Bretherton Family Trust et al. 10591 Garden Highway Sacramento, CA 95837
35-030-007	Langenkamp Surv Tr et al. 10533 Garden Highway Sacramento, CA 95837
35-030-016	Molina Family Trust et al. 10519 Garden Highway Sacramento, CA 95837

**Table A-3:  
Adjoining Property Owners**

<b>Assessor's Parcel #</b>	<b>Owner</b>
35-330-003      35-330-018 35-330-005      35-330-019 35-330-017      35-330-021	County of Sacramento Dept of Airports 6900 Airport Blvd Sacramento, CA 95837
35-330-020	Richard A. Sorensen PO Box 203 Citrus Heights, CA 95611
35-351-001	Barbara E Walker 10215 Garden Highway Sacramento, CA 95837
35-351-002	Stephen & Roberta Holm 10205 Garden Highway Sacramento, CA 953837
35-351-003	Robert M./Marilyn Caruthers et al. 10135 Garden Highway Sacramento, CA 95837
35-351-004	Marilyn Caruthers et al. 10135 Garden Highway Sacramento, CA 95837
35-351-005	Mark/Tracey Joachim 1626 Park Blvd West Sacramento, CA 95691
35-351-006	James W/Mildred Prouty 10111 Garden Highway Sacramento, CA 95837
35-351-007	Greg Hanson 1416 Silica Ave Box 4 Sacramento, CA 95815
35-352-001	Jeffery M Ogata et al. 10351 Garden Highway Sacramento, CA 95837
35-352-002	David E Clesi PO Box 2329 Woodland, CA 95776
35-352-003	Linda A Clesi et al. PO Box 2329 Woodland, CA 95776
35-352-004	Stephen L. Simard 10275 Garden Highway Sacramento, CA 95837
35-352-005	Alfred Zacharias et al. 8020 Oak Ave Roseville, CA 95678

**Table A-3:  
Adjoining Property Owners**

<b>Assessor's Parcel #</b>	<b>Owner</b>
35-361-002	Brian A. Fahey et al. 10461 Garden Highway Sacramento, CA 95837
35-361-003	Roy M. Dahlberg et al. 10451 Garden Highway Sacramento, CA 95837
35-361-004	Daryl Harr Rev '01 Tr 10437 Garden Highway Sacramento, CA 95837
35-361-005	Roland/Ellen Candee 10411 Garden Highway Sacramento, CA 95837
35-361-006	Mark C/Raquel A. Stevenson 10385 Garden Highway Sacramento, CA 95837
35-361-007	Elizabeth A. Roberts Tr. et al. PSC 3 Box 4954 APO San Francisco, CA 96266
35-361-008	Kenneth H./Marcia Fritz 9357 Honeywood Ct Orangevale, CA 95662
35-361-010	Alan E./Melinda L. Menigoz 10469 Garden Highway Sacramento, CA 95837
35-362-001 35-362-002	Lane '02 Tr et al. 6612 E Wolfe Lakewood, CA 90713
35-362-003	Gary N/Dorothy L. Knight 1420 Jonas Ave Sacramento, CA 95825
35-362-004	Burns Family Trust et al. 10621 Garden Highway Sacramento, CA 95837
35-362-005	Carol E. Swanson 10800 Garden Highway Sacramento, CA 95837

*\*Properties listed in Sacramento and Sutter Counties do not directly abut the site; rather, they adjoin the Sacramento River which in turn adjoins the site.*

Source: Data on file at Yolo County Assessor's Office, 2002; Data on file at Sacramento County Assessor's Office, 2003; Data on file at Sutter County Assessor's Office, 2003.

(g) *A plan to minimize the impact of the project on adjacent property owners, including but not limited to the following (Water Code Section 79041):*

- (1) *An evaluation of the impact on floodwaters*
- (2) *The structural integrity of affected levees*
- (3) *Diversion facilities*
- (4) *Customary agricultural husbandry practices*
- (5) *Timber extraction operations*
- (6) *An evaluation with regard to maintenance*

Please refer to section III(F), Minimum Qualifications, in the body of the grant application.

(h) *A description of the input and participation that local groups and affected parties provided in the preparation of the work plan and application.*

Please refer to section VI(E), Miscellaneous Benefits and Quality of Proposal, in the body of the grant application.

(i) *A statement relative to the use of a trust fund for maintenance, or any proposed alternative, as specified in Water Code Section 79044.*

Please see the audited financials for AFT for Fiscal Years 2001 and 2002 attached.

(j) *Either or both of the following, depending on applicability:*

- (1) *An analysis of the project benefits to wildlife habitat.*

Please refer to section V(A), Wildlife Benefits, in the body of the grant application.

- (2) *A description of project actions to preserve agricultural land.*

Please refer to section II, General Information, and V(B), Agricultural Land Conservation Benefits, in the body of the grant application.

(k) *A statement of qualifications for the project team.*

Please refer to section VI (D), Miscellaneous Benefits, in the body of the grant application.

(l) *A written statement by an attorney certifying that the applicant is authorized to enter into a grant agreement with the State of California.*

Please refer to Appendix F.

## APPENDIX B: References

### **Publications**

Bradbury, Mike. 1999. Summary of migration study results. Friends of the Swainson's Hawk website: <http://www.swainsonshawk.org/who.html>.

CDC (California Department of Conservation). 2002a. Table A-41. Yolo County 1998-2000 Land Conversion. Division of Land Resource Protection. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. From website accessed 11/27/02.

[http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/fmmp/pubs/1998\\_2000/conversion\\_tables/yolcon00.xls](http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/fmmp/pubs/1998_2000/conversion_tables/yolcon00.xls).

CDC. 2002b. Yolo County Important Farmland 2000.

CDFG (California Department of Fish and Game). 2002. California Natural Diversity Database. Summary of CNDDDB Search for the Knights Landing, Verona, Grays Bend, and Taylor Monument Quads. Information dated 9/11/02; run date 11/18/02.

CDTSC (California Department of Toxic Substances Control). 2003. Calsites database. Website <http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/calf001.cfm>. Accessed 2/4/03.

DOF (California Department of Finance). 1998. County Population Projections with Age, Sex and Race/Ethnic Detail. July 1, 1990-2040 in 10-year Increments. December.

DWR (California Department of Water Resources). 2002. Query of California Data Exchange Center (CDEC) computer at website <http://cdec.water.ca.gov/cgi-progs/stageF> for the Fremont Weir over the period 1/1/1984 to 12/3/2002. Accessed 12/3/02.

EIP and Yolo County HCP Steering Committee. 2001. Preliminary Draft Yolo County Habitat Conservation Plan. January.

England, A. S., M. J. Bechard, and C. S. Houston. 1997. Swainson's Hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*). In *The Birds of North America*, No. 265 (A. Poole and F. Gill, Eds.). Philadelphia: The Academy of Natural Sciences; Washington, D.C.: The American Ornithologists' Union.

FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency). 1998a. FIRM Flood Insurance Rate Map. Yolo County, California (Unincorporated Areas). Panel 320 of 725. Community Panel Number 060423 0320 D. Revised July 6.

FEMA. 1998b. FIRM Flood Insurance Rate Map. Yolo County, California (Unincorporated Areas). Panel 475 of 725. Community Panel Number 060423 0475 D. Revised July 6.

FEMA. 2002. FIRM Flood Insurance Rate Map. Yolo County, California (Unincorporated Areas). Panel 450 of 725. Community Panel Number 060423 0450 D. Revised April 2.

Jones & Stokes Associates, Inc. 1993. Suitability Analysis for Enhancing Wildlife Habitat in the Yolo Basin. November 18. (JSA 90-285). Sacramento, California. Prepared for Central Valley Habitat Joint Venture. Sacramento, California.

Kashing, Sara. 2002. "Vic Fazio Yolo Wildlife Area is overflowing with sights, sounds and science." In the Davis Enterprise. October 20.

Kuminoff, Nicolai; D. Sumner; G. Goldman. 2000. The Measure of California Agriculture, 2000. University of California Agricultural Issues Center. November. Revised, updated and expanded from The Measure of California Agriculture: Its Impact on the State Economy, December, 1998, by Harold O. Carter and George Goldman.

SAFCA. 2002. Improving the Yolo Bypass. Power Point Presentation to the Yolo Bypass Working Group. November 20. Presented by Butch Hodgkins.

SCS (U. S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service). 1972. Soil Survey of Yolo County, California. June. Version accessed at website <http://www.ca.nrcs.usda.gov/mlra/yolo/> on December 2, 2002.

Sommer et al. (Ted Sommer, Bill Harrell, Matt Nobriga, Randall Brown, Peter Moyle, Wim Kimmerer, and Larry Schemel). 2001. "California's Yolo Bypass: Evidence that flood control can be compatible with fisheries, wetlands, wildlife, and agriculture." In *Fisheries* volume 26 number 8. August.

U. S. Army Corps of Engineers and California Reclamation Board (USACOE and CRB)SRB). 1996. American River Watershed project California Main Report. March.

USACOE & SRB. 2002. Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins California Comprehensive Study Draft Interim Report. July 22.

USDA (United States Department of Agriculture). 2002. Fruit and Tree Nuts Situation and outlook yearbook. FTS-2002. Economic Research Service. October.

USDA. 2003. Economic Research Service Food Consumption Data System. <http://www.ers.usda.gov/data/foodconsumption/>. Web site accessed 2/6/03.

Woodbridge, B. 1998. California Partners in Flight Riparian Bird Conservation Plan for the Swainson's Hawk. Point Reyes Bird Observatory, Stinson Beach, CA.

Yolo Bypass Working Group, Yolo Basin Foundation, and Jones & Stokes. 2001. A Framework for the Future: Yolo Bypass Management Strategy. Final Report.

Yolo County. 1998. Yolo County 1998 Crop Report. Department of Agriculture. From website <http://www.yolocounty.org/org/ag/>. Accessed 11/27/02.

Yolo County. 1999. Yolo County 1999 Crop Report. Department of Agriculture. From website <http://www.yolocounty.org/org/ag/>. Accessed 11/27/02.

Yolo County. 2000. Yolo County 2000 Crop Report. Department of Agriculture. From website <http://www.yolocounty.org/org/ag/>. Accessed 11/27/02.

Yolo County. 2001. Yolo County 2001 Crop Report. Department of Agriculture. From website <http://www.yolocounty.org/org/ag/Acr01/Cover%20Letter%202001.pdf>. Accessed 11/27/02.

Yolo County. 2002a. Yolo County Code. Title 8, Chapter 3, "Flood Damage Prevention." Updated through Ordinance No. 1284, Effective May 30. Accessed at website <http://www.yolocounty.org/CountyCode/CountyCode.pdf> on December 3, 2002.

Yolo County. 2002b. Yolo County General Plan Agricultural Element Policy Document. Prepared by Quad Knopf. November.

Yolo County. 2002c. Yolo County Code. Title 10, Chapter 6, "Agriculture." Updated through Ordinance No. 1284, Effective May 30. Accessed at website <http://www.yolocounty.org/CountyCode/CountyCode.pdf> on December 3, 2002.

Yolo County. 2002d. Yolo County Hazardous Waste and Leaky Underground Tank Cases from May 2, 2002. Website <http://www.yolocounty.org/org/health/pdf/eh/cupa/hazmatlist.pdf>. Accessed 2/4/03.

Yurosek, Jeff. 2001. The River Ranch of Deseret Farms  $\pm$  3,682.40 acres – Yolo County, CA. November 2.

### **Personal Communications**

Nordstrom, James. California Department of Conservation. Fax sent November 27, 2002.

Pingel, Nathan. David Ford Consulting Engineers. E-mail sent 1/31/03.

## **APPENDIX C: Acronyms and Definitions**

AFT: American Farmland Trust.

AOF: Agriculture, Open space, and Flood facility/flowage. The project proposes to use grant funds to convey AOF easements on the project site to the state DWR.

CDC: California Department of Conservation.

CEQA: California Environmental Quality Act, California Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.

DWR: California Department of Water Resources.

EIR: Environmental Impact Report. A detailed analysis, required by CEQA, of the environmental effects of a project proposed at the state or local level.

EIS: Environmental Impact Statement. A detailed analysis, required by NEPA, of the environmental effects of a project proposed at the federal level.

FEMA: Federal Emergency Management Agency.

FPCP: Flood Protection Corridor Program.

NEPA: National Environmental Policy Act, 42 United States Code Section 4321 et seq.

NFIP: National Flood Insurance Program.

NRCS: Natural Resources Conservation Service.

Regional Project: The Lower Sacramento River Regional Project. This is a project now under study by SAFCA, USACOE, and SRB that would modify components of the SRFCP in the vicinity of the Yolo Bypass to improve flood protection near the lower Sacramento River, Feather River, and American River.

SAFCA: Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency.

SCS. The USDA Soil Conservation Services. Now the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service or NRCS.

SFHA: Special Flood Hazard Area. A FEMA designation of an area with a 1% or greater chance of being subject flood in a given year.

SRB: The California State Reclamation Board.



SRFCP: The Sacramento River Flood Control Project. The SRFCP is a State and Federal project initiated in the late 1800's that has grown to include a comprehensive set of levees, weirs, and bypasses that controls flood flows from the Sacramento River and its tributaries in the lower Sacramento Valley.

USACOE: United States Army Corps of Engineers. Sometimes referred to as just "the Corps."

USDA: United States Department of Agriculture.

## **Appendix D: CEQA Compliance**

### **I. Introduction**

The regulations for the Flood Protection Corridor Program (FPCP) are proposed to be incorporated into Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations, Division 2. Section 497.7 of this title addresses the contents of the application for grant funding. It specifies that the application include “a complete initial study environmental checklist as required by Section 15063(f), Title 1, California Code of Regulations, and if available a completed Environmental Impact Report or other environmental documentation as required by CEQA.”

The proposed project would consist only of the transfer of ownership of interest in land, and no physical environmental effects. Specifically, it would result in the fee title purchase of the land by American Farmland Trust (AFT) and the transfer of agricultural conservation easements to an appropriate entity. It would also result in the transfer of flood control easements from AFT to the State Department of Water Resources.

As a transfer of ownership of interest in land, the project is categorically exempt from CEQA under Section 15325 of the CEQA Guidelines, which applies to projects that transfer land “to preserve existing natural conditions,” “allow continued agricultural use,” or “prevent encroachment of development into flood plains.” The enclosed CEQA Initial Study Checklist is therefore submitted only in compliance with the regulations for the FPCP and is otherwise not required by law or regulation. The CEQA Guidelines do, however, provide that a categorical exemption shall not be used where “there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment” (Section 15300.2). Therefore, this Initial Study was also used to determine whether potential significant impacts would render a categorical exemption inappropriate for the project. No such significant impacts were identified.

This appendix includes the completed initial study environmental checklist followed by the Notice of Exemption for the project. Note that these are both in draft form. The only public agency action required to complete the project would be award of an FPCP grant by the Department of Water Resources. Thus, DWR would be the Lead Agency for the project if it is to go forward, and DWR staff signatures would be required on these CEQA notices or similar ones prepared by DWR.

## **II. Environmental Checklist Form**

1. Project title: River Ranch Agricultural Conservation and Flood Protection
2. Lead agency name and address:  
California Department of Water Resources  
1416 9<sup>th</sup> Street Room 1641  
Sacramento, CA 95814
3. Contact person and phone number: Bonnie Ross, (916) 654-4202
4. Project location: West of Yolo County Road 117, approximately 5 miles north of  
Interstate 5, and at the northern junction of the Yolo Bypass and the Sacramento River.
5. Project sponsor's name and address:  
American Farmland Trust  
260 Russell Blvd Suite D  
Davis, CA 95616
6. General plan designation: Agriculture
7. Zoning: Agricultural  
Preserve (A-P)
8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)  
The proposed project would consist of the purchase of the property by American Farmland Trust (AFT) and the transfer of agricultural conservation easements from AFT to an appropriate entity. It would also result in the transfer of flood control easements from AFT to the State Department of Water Resources. The project description is defined in greater detail in the "Flood Protection Corridor Program Grant Application: River Ranch Agricultural Conservation and Flood Protection" to which this initial study is an appendix and which is incorporated into this initial study by this reference and is available for review at the Lead Agency address listed above.
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings)  
The site is in agricultural use, including approximately 1,000 acres of walnut orchards, 2,000 acres of row crops, and developed agricultural structures, rural residences, and undeveloped wetland and riparian areas. The site is surrounded by agricultural uses similar to those occurring on the project site. These include row crops and orchards. The Yolo Bypass and the Sacramento River bound the property on the east and west. The setting is described in greater detail in the Flood Protection

Corridor Program Grant Application previously incorporated by reference.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

No public agency approval is required other than funding by DWR, the lead agency.

### ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources              | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources          | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality            | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services               | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems     | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |   |

### DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment. The project is categorically exempt from CEQA.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

---

Signature

---

Date

---

Printed Name

---

For

### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address project conditions.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

**ISSUES:**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS</b> -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**EXPLANATION:** The project would not result in any physical change. The easements to be conveyed would preserve existing use of the site. (Source: Project Description, first page of this checklist).

**II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**EXPLANATION:** The project would not result in any physical change. The easements to be conveyed would preserve existing use of the site. (Source: Project Description, Page 1 of this checklist).

**III. AIR QUALITY** -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**EXPLANATION:** The project would not result in any physical change. The easements to be conveyed would preserve existing use of the site. (Source: Project Description, first page of this checklist).

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**EXPLANATION:** The project would not result in any physical change. The easements to be conveyed would preserve existing use of the site. (Source: Project Description, first page of this checklist).

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**EXPLANATION:** The project would not result in any physical change. The easements to be conveyed would preserve existing use of the site. (Source: Project Description, first page of this checklist).

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS** -- Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**EXPLANATION:** The project would not result in any physical change. The easements to be conveyed would preserve existing use of the site. (Source: Project Description, first page of this checklist).

#### VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS --

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**EXPLANATION:** The project would not result in any physical change. The easements to be conveyed would preserve existing use of the site. (Source: Project Description, first page of this checklist). The site is not on Hazardous Materials site lists, including the California Department of Toxic Substances Control Calsites database (web site <http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/calf001.cfm>) and the Yolo County Hazardous Waste and Leaky Underground Tank Cases from May 2, 2002 (web site <http://www.yolocounty.org/org/health/pdf/eh/cupa/hazmatlist.pdf>).

#### VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY --

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**EXPLANATION:** The project would not result in any physical change. The easements to be conveyed would preserve existing use of the site. (Source: Project Description, first page of this checklist). As such it would reduce the potential for future development of damageable or occupied structures at the site. By providing the State with flowage easements over the site, it would also preserve an opportunity for future flood protection works on the project site that could reduce exposure of people and structures east of the Sacramento River to flooding.

**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING** - Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

**EXPLANATION:** The project would not result in any physical change. The easements to be conveyed would preserve existing agricultural and open space use of the site. (Source: Project Description, first page of this checklist). This is consistent with preservation of regional habitats and with the agricultural protection policies of the Yolo County General Plan.

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?                                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**EXPLANATION:** The project would not result in any physical change. The easements to be conveyed would preserve existing use of the site. (Source: Project Description, first page of this checklist).

**XI. NOISE** -- Would the project result in:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**EXPLANATION:** The project would not result in any physical change. The easements to be conveyed would preserve existing use of the site. (Source: Project Description, first page of this checklist).

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING</b> -- Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**EXPLANATION:** The project would not result in any physical change. The easements to be conveyed would preserve existing use of the site and thus reduce the potential for growth on site. (Source: Project Description, first page of this checklist). The project would not extend any infrastructure (including flood control infrastructure) that would induce substantial population growth. See also the discussion of cumulative impacts in item XVII of this checklist.

### XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**EXPLANATION:** The project would not result in any physical change or change in demand for services. The easements to be conveyed would preserve existing use of the site. (Source: Project Description, first page of this checklist).

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

#### XIV. RECREATION

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

**EXPLANATION:** The project would not result in any physical change. The easements to be conveyed would preserve existing use of the site. (Source: Project Description, first page of this checklist).

#### XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

e) Result in inadequate emergency access? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

**EXPLANATION:** The project would not result in any physical change or change in population or traffic volumes. The easements to be conveyed would preserve existing use of the site. (Source: Project Description, first page of this checklist).

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:</b>				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**EXPLANATION:** The project would not result in any physical change or change in water or wastewater treatment demand. The easements to be conveyed would preserve existing use of the site. (Source: Project Description, first page of this checklist).

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**EXPLANATION:** The project would not result in any physical change. The easements to be conveyed would preserve existing use of the site. (Source: Project Description, first page of this checklist).

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>b)</b> Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**EXPLANATION:** The project would not result in any physical change. The easements to be conveyed would preserve existing use of the site. (Source: Project Description, first page of this checklist).

Section 15065(c) of the CEQA Guidelines specifies that a project may have a significant effect if its individually limited environmental effects are "cumulatively considerable." The Guidelines also indicate that cumulative impacts should not be addressed if they "do not result in part from the project." The project consists only of a land transfer that would have no physical effects and is eligible for a categorical exemption from CEQA pursuant to Guidelines section 15325, as borne out by this checklist. Since the project has no environmental effects, it also cannot contribute, even incrementally, to cumulative effects.

The easements conveyed by the project would be useful for regional short- or long-term flood control solutions as identified in the grant application to which this analysis is appended and as described in more detail by the US Army Corps of Engineers and the State of California Reclamation Board in the July 22, 2002 document "Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins California Comprehensive Study Draft Interim Report." However, the project does not induce those projects within the meaning of CEQA because it does not increase the necessity for or compel those projects to occur. The flood easements on the project site are only a portion of the total easements that would need to be obtained, and their acquisition does not remove an obstacle to development of those regional projects (in addition to other land acquisitions, substantial agency collaboration, design, permitting, and approval would be required to further the regional projects). Likewise, the mere existence of flood easements on the site does not compel the modification of flood control structures or foreshorten the range of options for a regional project if it is pursued. The project will also have acquired agricultural conservation easements over the property and allowed it to remain in private ownership and management, which will be benefits of the project whether or not a regional project ever goes forward.

<b>c)</b> Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**EXPLANATION:** The project would not result in any physical change or change in water or wastewater treatment demand. The easements to be conveyed would preserve existing use of the site. (Source: Project Description, first page of this checklist).

**Note:** Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21087, Public Resources Code. Reference: Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151, Public Resources Code; Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino, 202 Cal.App.3d 296 (1988); Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors, 222 Cal.App.3d 1337 (1990).



### III. Notice of Exemption

**To:** ☒ Office of Planning and Research  
PO Box 3044, 1400 Tenth St Rm 222  
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

**From:** (Agency) CA Dept. of Water Resources  
1416 9<sup>th</sup> Street Room 1641

☒ County Clerk  
County of Yolo  
PO Box 1130  
Woodland, CA 95776

Sacramento, CA 95814  
(Address)

**Project Title:** River Ranch Agricultural Conservation and Flood Protection

**Project Location – Specific:** West of Yolo County Road 117 approximately 5 miles north of Interstate 5 and at the northern junction of the Yolo Bypass and the Sacramento River.

**Project Location – City:** N/A **Project Location – County:** Yolo

**Description of Project:** American Farmland Trust (AFT) would purchase the project site and State Flood Protection Corridor Program funds would be used to convey agricultural conservation and flood easements on the 3,700-acre River Ranch property. No physical changes would occur as a result of the project, but it would be protected for agricultural use in perpetuity. It would preserve the future opportunity for the relocation or construction of flood control facilities at the site, but such actions would be separate projects subject to CEQA.

**Name of Public Agency Approving Project:** California Department of Water Resources

**Name of Person or Agency Carrying Out Project:** California Department of Water Resources

**Exempt Status:** (check one)

- ☐ Ministerial (Sec. 21080(b)(1); 15268);
- ☐ Declared Emergency (Sec. 21080(b)(3); 15269(a));
- ☐ Emergency Project (Sec. 21080(b)(4); 15269(b)(c));
- ☒ Categorical Exemption. State type and section number: Transfer land to preserve, Section 15325
- ☐ Statutory Exemptions. State code number: \_\_\_\_\_

**Reasons why project is exempt:** Class 25 consists of transfers of ownership in interests in land to preserve open space and habitat, including actions to “allow continued agricultural use” and “prevent encroachment of development into flood plains.” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15325). The project would result only in the transfer of agricultural conservation and flood easements on the subject site and would not result in any physical change or environmental impact. (See succeeding discussion).

#### Lead Agency

**Contact Person:** Bonnie Ross **Area Code/Phone/Ext.:** (916) 654-4202

**If filed by applicant:**

1. Attach certified document of exemption finding.
2. Has Notice of Exemption been filed by the public agency approving the project? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Title: \_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ Signed by Lead Agency Date received for filing at OPR: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Signed by Applicant

## **IV. Discussion of Exemption**

### **Introduction**

The project qualifies for a Class 25 categorical exemption under CEQA Guidelines section 15325. Pursuant to this section, exempt projects include “transfers of ownership in interests in land in order to preserve open space, habitat, or historical resources. Specific (but not limiting) examples cited in the Guidelines include acquisition of land interests for preserving existing conditions, including preserving or restoring plant or animal habitats, continued agricultural use, or prevention of encroachment of development into flood plains, which are the uses that comprise the proposed project.

### **Project Description**

The proposed project would consist of the purchase of the project site by American Farmland Trust (AFT) and the transfer of agricultural conservation easements to an appropriate entity. It would also result in the transfer of flood control easements from AFT to the State Department of Water Resources. The State action that is involved in the project would be, if awarded, the granting of funding to AFT enabling the easement rights to be separated from the land and conveyed to their respective recipients. The project description is defined in greater detail in the “Flood Protection Corridor Program Grant Application: River Ranch Agricultural Conservation and Flood Control Easements” to which this document is an appendix and which is incorporated into this appendix by reference.

### **Exceptions for Categorical Exemptions**

Section 15300.2 of the CEQA Guidelines lists six exceptions under which Categorical Exemptions may not be used for particular projects. These are discussed in relationship to the proposal as follows:

a. Location. Exemptions in Classes 3, 4, 5, 6, and 11 shall not be used for projects in particularly sensitive environments. This exception does not apply to Class 25 exemptions such as the project qualifies for.

b. Cumulative Impact. When “the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant” an exemption shall not apply. As noted in the initial study presented earlier in this appendix, the project would not have any cumulative impacts. Furthermore, it is apparent that no matter how many projects like the proposed project are approved, each one would have no impacts and so the cumulative impact of the successive projects would not be significant.

c. Significant Effects. Categorical Exemptions shall not be used for projects with significant effects. As noted in the preceding initial study, the proposed project would not have significant effects.

d. Scenic Highways. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may damage scenic resources. The proposed project would have no impact on scenic resources.

e. Hazardous Waste Sites. A categorical exemption shall not be used for projects on listed hazardous material sites. The proposed project site does not contain listed sites (CDTSC, 2003; Yolo County, 2002d).

f. Historical Resources. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may cause of substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. The project would have no effect on historical resources, as detailed in the preceding initial study.